UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/648,140	08/25/2003	Richard Harvey	063170.6611	3247
5073 BAKER BOTT	7590 08/13/200 S L.L.P.	EXAMINER		
2001 ROSS AV	ENUE	LEWIS, ALICIA M		
SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 7	75201-2980	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2164	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/13/2008	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/648,140	HARVEY ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	

-							
	Alicia M. Lewis	2164					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress				
THE REPLY FILED <u>15 July 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP 1. ☐ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following	the same day as filing a Notice of	Appeal. To avoid abai					
application, applicant must timely me one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	with 37 CFR 41.31; or	r (3) a Request				
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date	a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing date of the final rejection.						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO							
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). ktensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee							
nave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
NOTICE OF APPEAL 2.	oliance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two month	s of the date of				
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any externotice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed w AMENDMENTS	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the					
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, l	but prior to the date of filing a brief	will not be entered be	ecause				
(a) They raise new issues that would require further co	nsideration and/or search (see NOT		oddoc				
(c) They are not deemed to place the application in bet appeal; and/or			he issues for				
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).		ected claims.					
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.1121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).							
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided the status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:		l be entered and an e	xplanation of				
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE	t before or on the date of filing a Nie	ation of Apparal will pot	t be entered				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, bu because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 							
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to of showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	ıl and/or appellant fail	s to provide a				
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanatio REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER							
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered bu See Continuation Sheet.	t does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:				
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)						
/Charles Rones/							
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2164							

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Shiman fails to teach "defining attributes of a specific type which correspond to a specific object class, each attribute unique to the specific object class to which the attribute belongs" Examiner disagrees. Shiman teaches that an object class is a type of object comprised of certain attributes, and that objects are manifestations of object classes defined by the value of their attributes. He further teaches that an object is indexed by the value of the primary key attribute. Applicant argues that the primary key is unique for the object and not the object class. However, it is well known in the art that a primary key attribute uniquely identifies an object class. The VALUE of the primary key attribute (i.e. red hair) uniquely identifies a specific object (i.e., a person named John), while the actual primary key attribute (i.e. hair color) uniquely identifies the object class (i.e., people). Therefore, Shiman does teach the above limitation.

Applicant also argues that Shiman does not teach that object classes are a subclass of an abstract object class. Examiner disagrees. Shiman teaches that classes are abstract, specifying a type of object that may be created, and that objects are defined by the values of their attributes in their abstract object class. Thus, it is clear that object classes may be thought of as subclasses of an abstract object class.

Lastly, Applicant argues that Shiman does not teach "providing specific attributes which relate to one object class for a purpose of enhancing searching. Examiner disagrees. Shiman teaches that specific attributes, such as primary keys, are used to index object classes. He further teaches that the use of databases for search and retrieval. Therefore, the attributes are used for enhanced searching. Examiner would also like to point out that the intended use of an element (i.e. the specific attributes) does not necessarily limit the claim.